

Rennebaum said that he, thinking Kernan would have installed the wash basins before we arrived, had told Hunt-Wesson the camp was in good shape.

Yet he also said there was no indication in the bureau's files that the camp operator had met the requirement of a July 5 inspection in which he was ordered to "provide evidence of the safe sanitary condition of the water supply."

This was a new requirement, Rennebaum explained somewhat lamely, and one on which he said the state does not demand strict compliance.

When Corn and I asked to see a copy of the latest inspection report on the camp, we were told it had not been received yet by the bureau's Trenton office.

Yersak, the bureau chief, said it would be illegal for the company to deduct \$15 a week from the checks of the boys who moved out of the camp.

We telephoned Hunt-Wesson and asked Holbrook, the regional industrial relations executive about this. He said the money would not be deducted, as Serata had told us it would. I asked to speak to Serata.

"He has left the company," Holbrook said. "I took care of that at noon yesterday."

Holbrook said Hunt-Wesson was paying the cost of bringing the camp up to state standards.

All of the Tennesseans had been put to work by Wednesday afternoon, Holbrook told us—and 98 of the 111 were still working with 93 still living in the labor camp.

I also called Morris Kernan, the camp owner, and told him I was a reporter. He seemed to assume immediately that any story I would write would be unfavorable, although he claimed conditions in the camp were "far better" than what "a large percentage" of the Tennesseans had at home. Like Serata, he told me he had contacted a lawyer to sue me.

"If you paint a bad picture," he said, "you may be in trouble." There was a pause and then he added.

"Not from me. Are you taking notes on this? If you are, tear them up because I haven't talked to you." The telephone line went dead, and Corn and I started the long trip home to file our story.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 20, 1967]

MIGRANT WORKER: BOUND TO SQUALOR— REPORT ON VIRGINIA EASTERN SHORE (By Hank Burchard)

CHERITON, Va., August 19.—If you approach the Farm Bureau labor camp for migrant workers here from downwind, you may smell it half a mile away.

The stench is a blend of human waste and sweat and garbage and the sharp, dank odor of the sandy gray soil of the Delmarva Peninsula.

It is characteristic of nearly all of the 150 migrant camps in the Virginia Eastern Shore counties of Northampton and Accomack.

Cheriton, whose 140-odd double cabins make it the largest of the camps that house the Shore's 8000 or more migrants, is not a bad example of the prevailing living conditions. It is better than most of the 47 camps visited by The Washington Post in recent weeks, and it is described by officials of the State Health Department as above average. Cheriton has, for instance, running water.

Each and every camp has been inspected by the State Health Department and issued a permit. This is supposed to mean minimum standards set by law have been met.

Dule Robinson of Apopka, Fla., a 28-year-old mother of five, was living at Cheriton a week ago. She seemed oblivious to the swarms of buzzing, biting flies swarming around as she sat in the doorway of her 10-by-10 foot half-cabin.

Normally she would have been in the fields during the daylight hours, working alongside

her husband picking tomatoes for 15 cents the ½ bushel, or potatoes or cucumbers or beans or corn or broccoli. She was packing because the family had decided to pull out for the truck farms of New York.

GOT BAD START

"It's a good crew, but Mr. Denton (the crew leader) got a bad start this year and we done wound up at this place 'cause the good places (in other states) done got their pickers already. So we come here. Ain' never coming here again, you can believe that."

The seven Robinsons were packed in a shack that wasn't much when the Federal Government built Cheriton camp during World War II. It has a leaky tin roof, a bare light bulb, two windows with torn screens, three rusty cots with greasy mattresses and uncounted flies, mosquitoes, bedbugs, fleas, chiggers and other assorted vermin.

She cooks on a two-burner kerosene stove they brought with them. She washes the plates on which they eat fat pork, greens and tomatoes in a galvanized tub they also brought with them. To fill the tub she carries it 30 yards to a faucet that supplies a dozen families.

The faucet rises from the center of a garbage-filled mud puddle. There are a dozen sinks in the camp's one washhouse, but that's about twice as far, and during the infrequent times when there is hot water available, it takes a long time to get a turn.

Dule (pronounced Dooley) Robinson is dirty. Her children are dirty. So is her husband. Their bodies and clothes are washed in the same tub used for the dishes but it doesn't do much good.

Why don't they use the two showers available (one for women, one for men) to the 600 to 800 workers housed at Cheriton? The floor is covered with human feces and soaked with urine.

CHILDREN DIRTY TOO

Why don't people use the pit privies? For one thing, the approaches to them also are strewn with human excrement. So are the seats inside. There is no evidence there ever was toilet paper.

"We tried putting the children in the car and going down the road to the gas station," Dule Robinson said. "But the man wouldn't let us use his bathrooms even after we bought gas."

"Now we just go down the road a ways." For the privilege of living in half a shack at Cheriton the workers pay \$5 (for a family) to \$8 (for four adults of the same sex) a week.

Assuming minimum charge and minimum occupancy, the camp apparently takes in at least \$1000 a week from May through September. The landlord farm bureau, a private growers' association, claims high maintenance costs result in a loss.

OTHER CAMPS ON PAR

The other three farm camps are on a par with Cheriton, according to the Health Department. The remaining 12 dozen camps are individually owned by farmers and canneries. The farm camps are much smaller than Cheriton, usually housing only one crew of as few as 10 to 150 workers or so, plus their children (when statistics about Shore migrants are compiled, they generally refer to the number of workers "plus children").

These smaller camps charge no rent, at least not officially, although some crew leaders are said to demand money from the workers beyond the standard rakeoff—if the farmer pays a quarter per basket of tomatoes, the crew leader gets a dime—for "services supplied."

In the individual farmers' camps, running water is a rarity, even though State law requires "adequate housing, suitable to the kinds of workers employed . . . with facilities that provide reasonable conveniences and comfort."

The State standards are ignored by most

farmers here. The requirements, adopted in 1962, specify sound construction and such things as hot and cold running water in new camps but set no deadline for the updating of camps built before then. There is little new construction.

MEET REQUIREMENTS

In existing camps, the health law says, "The camp operator (owner) shall be responsible for meeting the requirements and regulations. He . . . shall inspect the grounds . . . each week and see that it is maintained in a clean and orderly condition."

"An adequate and convenient supply of uncontaminated water shall be available at all times (one hand pump supplies a whole camp in many cases) . . . one privy seat for each 20 persons . . . laundry trays or wash tubs shall be provided on the basis of one for each 30 persons."

"One (bathing) tub for each 15 persons . . . in rooms used for sleeping at least one window opening to the outer air . . . at least 100 square feet of floor space for each person (some sheds of less than 100 square feet sleep six or more workers)."

"Between assignment to different persons, each bed, cot, or bunk shall be furnished with mattresses with clean covers or straw filled ticks . . . (which) shall be kept in a sanitary condition and laundered or otherwise sanitized (you can scrape greasy filth off a typical mattress with a fingernail)."

All windows must be screened (some are) and screen doors must have self-closing devices (but screen doors are not required).

Adequate refrigeration must be provided, it says, but the only refrigerator a reporter saw was hauled in by a crew leader. "Metal cans with tight fitting covers for garbage" (a reporter saw none), with pickups twice a week.

EFFECTIVE MEASURES

"Effective measures shall be taken to control rodents, flies, mosquitoes, bedbugs or other insects (such measures are unheard of). Fire protection equipment (one sand bucket was sent) and first aid supplies (none). Rooms shall have at least two exits" (some do have man-sized gaps in two or more walls).

Most, if not all, of these requirements are unmet in camp after camp.

Of the scores of workers and crew leaders interviewed, all but one said Virginia's Eastern Shore camps are the worst in the East. The lone dissenter, crew leader Leonard (Punch) Mulberry, said he thinks South Carolina is worse.

Dr. Belle Fears, health director for the two Shore counties, said there are "a few" camps under her jurisdiction which substantially comply with the State health laws she is charged with enforcing, but she couldn't say whether these few would number as many as a dozen of the 150 camps.

REGULAR INSPECTIONS

Under the law, the camps are to be regularly inspected by her subordinates and apparently they are. It is her duty to inform the camp owners of the requirements, to warn them if standards are not met and, if compliance does not follow, to close the camps and prosecute the owners.

Dr. Fears has been health director here for four years. She said there have been some camps closed during that time. She's not sure how many prosecutions there have been.

"What am I supposed to do? We try to persuade the growers to fix up their camps, and some of them have gone along with us. But as soon as they put in a screen or a shower or clean up, the workers tear it all down again."

"Suppose we took all the growers to court—the cases would just be thrown out. Growers are very important men around here and even if it got to a jury there would never be a fine or a sentence. Judges, bank-

ers, people at the Court House—they own the farms."

Asked if what she meant was that the State laws governing mainland Virginia cannot be enforced along the Eastern Shore, Dr. Fears said, "Well, we like to feel we make a little progress every year."

William J. Timm is the State director of the Virginia Migrant Labor Health Project, a program 80 per cent funded by the U.S. Public Health Service. The project is now in its fourth year and has received more than \$500,000 in Federal funds.

CONDITIONS SEEM TERRIBLE

Although there are 14 other Virginia counties—in the Shenandoah apple region—where there is significant use of migrant labor, nearly all of the money and effort is being spent on the Shore because the upland apple growers "maintain very fine conditions on their own initiative," he said.

Timm is an employee of the State Health Department and supervises the work of Dr. Fears and the 28 other staff members of the project.

"I know to an outsider the conditions in these camps must seem pretty terrible," Timm said. "It is pretty terrible, and I'm afraid there hasn't been as much progress as we would like."

"But you must understand the special difficulties under which we work. I have to live with these people (the growers). For instance, this year I am president of the Rotary Club in Cape Charles, and the majority of the influential members are growers."

"One of the worst camps is right across from where I live and if the wind is right it isn't very pleasant, I can tell you."

"Now the farmer who owns it is a fine man and as good a friend and neighbor as I've ever had. He keeps my son's riding horse for us and won't take a cent for it. But if anybody tries to talk to him about his camp he gets awfully upset. The farmers around here are pretty independent and individualistic."

AWFUL LANGUAGE

"One of our health aides visited him and tried to talk to him about now clean camps make good healthy workers but he got mad and said some terrible things to her, just awful language, I couldn't believe it when I heard about it, and ran her off."

"I'd like to talk to him about the camp, but I just don't know how I'd go about it."

Timm, 63, retired to the Shore six years ago after 31 years with the A&P in New York City.

"I am preparing a strong recommendation," he said, "that some way be found so that we can control the type of migrant who comes into this part of the State."

"We get a very unhealthy selection, the less desirable element among the migrants."

Timm said he has not recommended a crackdown on the farmers. "It wouldn't work," he said, echoing Dr. Fears' fears that such a campaign would collapse in the courts. "The power structure around here is pretty clear," he said.

CLINICAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Timm and Dr. Fears would rather talk about the extensive clinical health program they are running for the workers. The main thrust of the program has been in this direction and, judging from the 72-page annual report and the comments of the workers, much has been accomplished.

Timm conceded that conditions in the camps "certainly are responsible for some of the health problems our clinics deal with... our attack on the problem is a little one-sided, I guess."

Crew leaders and workers agree with Timm that the workers who come here are not the best. "Look," said one, "the only reason I'm here is because the other crew leaders beat me out for the good places farther up the Shore (in Maryland and Delaware). Half my people dropped out when they found out we

was coming here, and I've had to sign on every kind of wino and bum."

"Nobody comes to Virginia if they can help it. Damn this State!"

Timm said the Shenandoah growers, who have combined to build large central camps rather than use scattered sheds and barns and corn cribs as is done on the shore, have found that "it is cheaper to run good clean camps. But maybe the economics of apple-growing are different."

AWARE OF CONDITIONS

Helen Johnston, chief of the Migrant Health Branch of the U.S. Public Health Service that administers the Virginia grant, said she is aware of the conditions prevailing in the Eastern Shore camps.

Other than withdrawal of Federal funds, she said, there is little that can be done about it from the Washington level. "We must consider who would be hurt if we cut off the program," Miss Johnston said. "The State people had no interest in caring for migrants before we got involved, and I hardly think they would care if we pulled out. All we can offer through Federal aid is incentive to improve conditions."

"Enforcement of the State health laws is a State responsibility. And enforcement often must be done through local courts and local governments that are dominated by growers."

Paul Agnano, a sanitary engineer consultant to the PHS Migrant Health Project, said he agrees that camp conditions on Virginia's Eastern Shore are deplorable, "but they compare with parts of Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey and New York where what we call the 'Eastern Stream' of migrants work. Some other States are far worse."

The "Eastern Stream" workers generally start their working year in Florida and work their way north as crops grow ripe, stopping in Georgia, the Carolinas, Virginia and into Delaware, New Jersey and sometimes to New York and then back down again for late crops, arriving back in Florida for the citrus season.

Most of the migrants along the Shore this year are Negro, with a few Mexican-Americans, a very few whites, some Puerto Ricans and Cubans.

NEW STANDARDS

Their children attend schools set up specially for migrants (an eight-week school here just closed) and some families, with working children, can even break out of the pattern, eventually moving up to trailers and then out of the whole business. But most don't make enough and many are in hock to the crew bosses, who make sure they stay at it.

The Department of Labor on July 1 issued new migrant housing standards designed to upgrade conditions. States failing to meet the new requirements will not be allowed to use the Federal labor recruiting service.

In areas such as the Virginia Shore, Agnano said, "we have warned (the Labor Department) that the result is likely to be importation of workers either from other parts of the State or from other States by individual farmers or growers' associations. The new standards would not apply in such cases."

Many Shore workers already are recruited through such a "black market," and local observers say the practice will become the rule if tough enforcement is attempted.

[From the New York Times]

PANEL BIDS HUGHES SHUT FARM CAMPS (By Ronald Sullivan)

FREEHOLD, N.J., August 21.—Gov. Richard J. Hughes' Migrant Labor Task Force has called on the state to close immediately, as public nuisances, several migrant labor camps in South Jersey.

Several members of the task force threatened today to resign if the Governor did not act.

In a resolution passed last week by the

group and made public here today, the Governor was strongly urged to shut "those migrant labor camps which are presently disapproved and yet which still flagrantly violate the provisions of the Migrant Labor Law."

The Governor announced in Trenton today that he had ordered state officials "to convene immediately and consider steps for the prompt cessation of these conditions."

"The dangers to health and, indeed, the inhumanity of a continuation of such conditions is intolerable," he said in a message to five state officials who have overlapping responsibility for enforcing the state's migrant labor code.

But according to a member of the task force, which held a public hearing today on migrant labor conditions in Monmouth County, the Governor's message did not go far enough. He said several members of the group were prepared to resign if the Governor did not take action to close the disapproved camps immediately.

The task force declared that the camps were "rife" with violations that included overcrowding, grossly polluted water, inadequate garbage facilities and unsanitary open privies.

The resolution pointed out that the violations had existed all summer but that the camps were allowed to remain open.

OTHER JOBS URGED, TOO

The resolution strongly urged the Governor "to mobilize immediately" so that "migrant workers displaced from migrant labor camps are provided with adequate housing and, where possible, other employment."

"The task force believes that the department of the executive branch of the government of this state have adequate resources—whether technical, financial, or personnel—to provide such employment opportunities and housing," the resolution declared.

The task force has 11 members and its chairman is J. Stanley Husid.

The task force made a series of recommendations earlier this summer to improve conditions for about 15,000 Negro migrants who come to New Jersey every summer to work on the produce farms.

But a leading member of the task force who asked not to be identified said several members were convinced that their recommendations were "subverted" by the reluctance of the Hughes administration to implement them.

"The Governor knows we're mad and that we mean business this time," he said.

The group identified at least five growers in Cumberland County as having many violations.

A member of the Task Force said one of the camps housed 130 migrants, when it was only supposed to accommodate 90.

THE JAM WE ARE IN

Mr. HARTKE, Mr. President, I am concerned about the leadership of the United States in world affairs. There is no question about the United States greatness and her capacity for leadership. Yet "there is an erosion of confidence that you can almost smell, these days, in Washington's hot, humid air."

This "erosion of confidence" stems from the awareness "that there has never been a time since the last World War ended when the United States has been more nearly alone in the world."

This problem is dealt with by Mr. Stewart Alsop in the Saturday Evening Post of July 22, 1967. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JAM WE ARE IN (By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—There is an erosion of confidence that you can almost smell, these days, in Washington's hot, humid air. The Washington mood is a bit like that expressed in the sad little ditty unhappy children used to recite: "Nobody loves me, everybody hates me, goin' out in the garden and eat worms..."

Our side won the Middle Eastern war, and for a few days after the brilliant Israeli victory there was a brief euphoria in official Washington. Since then, the fact has become increasingly clear that Israel's victory was by no means necessarily a victory for the United States. For it has also become increasingly clear that there has never been a time since the last world war ended when the United States has been more nearly alone in the world.

Hardly anybody loves us, and a great many people hate us. Even the Israelis by no means love us. As several correspondents have reported from the scene, the Israelis have little admiration for this country and no sense of gratitude, and regard U.S. policy as feeble and vacillating.

The Arabs, of course, hate us. This hatred is generally dismissed in this country as mere hysteria, fanned by vicious propaganda. It is that, but it is more than that. In order to make their amazing little state viable in 1948, the Israelis forced hundreds of thousands of Arabs out of Arab cities like Jaffa and Haifa, and off the land they had tilled for centuries. Now it seems likely that the Arab refugees of 1948 will be joined in their filthy camps by tens of thousands of new refugees from Old Jerusalem and the land west of the Jordan. Is it really very surprising that the Arabs hate the Israelis? And is it any wonder that the Arabs hate the United States, as the sponsor and protector of Israel, almost more than they hate Israel itself?

In the aftermath of the six-day war, there was some hope in official Washington that the Soviets would work "in parallel" with the United States to damp down the Middle-Eastern hatreds and achieve a lasting settlement. President Johnson and Premier Kosygin did not come to blows at Holly Bush, but they came to no agreement either, and since then the hope has been dying. It seems much more probable that Soviet policy was accurately predicted by an unnamed Soviet official (probably the Russian ambassador in Paris) who was quoted as follows in the French weekly, *Le Nouvel Observateur*:

"The diplomatic and political battle we are going to wage at the side of the Arabs... will be very hard. We will blackmail the Americans with respect to their oil interests and their shipping in the Suez Canal... We will lead an incessant propaganda campaign among the young generations [of Arabs] against the cowards, the opportunists and the collaborators of the Anglo-Americans..."

In this battle, Arab hatred will be a most useful weapon. And the stakes are high. The Israelis are brave fighters, but the Arabs outnumber them by more than 15 to 1 and they are sitting on the world's greatest proved reserves of oil in what is historically one of the world's greatest strategic land areas.

Moreover, in their "diplomatic and political battle" against the "Anglo-Americans," it is now clear, the Soviets will have an enthusiastic ally in Charles de Gaulle's France. Official Washington was hardly surprised when de Gaulle refused to join the consortium to assert the right of peaceful passage in the Gulf of Aqaba, or when he cut off the supply of arms to France's former ally, Israel.

But there was surprise—and a good deal of rage—when it was learned that two French oil companies, with official encouragement, had attempted to move in on the Anglo-American oil interests in the oil-producing

Arab countries. "If de Gaulle really does that," said one normally unemotional American official, "we ought to break diplomatic relations with Paris."

It has taken a long time, but the conclusion is at last being forced upon the American Government that de Gaulle really does regard the United States not only as an enemy but as the enemy. The final rupture by de Gaulle of the French-American alliance has undermined the whole American system of alliances.

NATO may be a long time a-dying, but it is dying surely, killed by de Gaulle. The German-American alliance, once rock-firm, is seriously enfeebled. The Germans, and the Japanese and the Italians as well, may join with the French in the assault on the Anglo-American oil interests in the Middle East. The British, alone among our major allies, supported the project to assert the right of passage in the Gulf of Aqaba.

If, as a consequence of joining this country in that attempt, the British lose their oil holdings in the Arab countries, it will be a near-total economic catastrophe for them. They may be so enfeebled that they will have no choice but to crawl into the Common Market on hands and knees, on de Gaulle's terms. De Gaulle's basic condition, of course, is the death and public burial of the Anglo-American alliance. If that alliance dies, the United States will indeed be alone in the world, and this is one reason for the erosion of confidence you can smell in Washington's air. The other, of course, is Vietnam.

"In a way," one high official has remarked privately, "we were as wrong about Vietnam as about the Bay of Pigs." He did not mean that this country was necessarily wrong to intervene in Vietnam. He did mean that the cost of intervention, in casualties, in expenditures, in military-force levels, and above all in the time required to achieve a settlement, was vastly underestimated. The awful thought that an acceptable settlement may be unachievable, and the war unwinnable, is beginning to occur, even to former official optimists.

In short, this country is in a jam all over the world. The jam we are in could be worse. It would be worse if Nasser were presiding in triumph over Tel Aviv, or Ho Chi Minh over Saigon, for example. But it is a very bad jam all the same, and we won't get out of it by going out in the garden and eating worms.

The jam we are in requires facing up to some hard questions. For example, if de Gaulle is determined to treat us as an enemy, should we not treat him likewise? What price will we pay to keep Britain out of the Common Market, and thus preserve the only alliance we have that is worth preserving? And is more of the same really all we can do in Vietnam?

The trouble is that to the people who should be asking such questions, the asking itself is a confession of failure. Many of these people are brilliantly able. But perhaps new men are needed to do the new thinking which now so clearly needs to be done

"HOW TO START A RIOT"—ADDRESS BY EVELLE YOUNGER

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, all responsible Americans deplore the violence that has rocked so many of our cities. Like an epidemic they seem to have spread across our Nation. Now is the time for all straight-thinking citizens of every race, creed, and color to speak out against such lawlessness.

Evelle Younger, former superior court judge and now the very competent district attorney for Los Angeles County, on August 2 addressed the National Asso-

ciation of Defense Lawyers in Criminal Cases. His speech, entitled "How To Start a Riot" or "Something To Displease Everyone," is one of the best treatments of this serious subject I have seen. It deserves nationwide attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Younger's outstanding speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOW TO START A RIOT OR SOMETHING TO DISPLEASE EVERYONE

(By Evelle J. Younger, district attorney, county of Los Angeles, State of California)

All citizens must be bewildered and alarmed by the tragic riots that have been occurring with frightening frequency in our nation. However, as lawyers who practice criminal law, you must be especially concerned and interested because, whatever else a riot is—racial protest, rebellion, social revolution, you name it—it most certainly is one tremendous crime spree. Everyone who participates in a riot is a criminal. Accordingly, I selected this subject as one that you might consider timely and interesting. Besides, I claim some degree of expertise in this area. I don't claim to know how to stop riots, and even if I did, I wouldn't speak on that subject. Hundreds of public officials throughout the land, from the President on down, are telling us how to stop them. The field is overcrowded.

I do claim to know something about how to start a riot—having been rather intimately connected with the Watts Riot and having made a serious study of other recent outbreaks—and to my knowledge, there have been no previous speeches or articles on how to start a riot; so that seems an appropriate subject for this convention.

Before outlining procedures to be followed in starting a riot, and in order that you may better understand these recommended procedures, it is, probably advisable to identify the personnel ingredients of a riot. What kind of people participate in a riot? In every recent Class "A" riot in America, virtually all of the people involved have been Negro. In Detroit, some white hoodlums moved in for the looting and attacked targets of opportunity, but they were not really a factor.

In any particular city, however, from 90 to 95% of the Negro community will not support or participate in a riot. These responsible Negroes, in fact, are the big losers in any riot and they know it; so they are understandably more frightened by and critical of those who participate in riots than are members of the white community. Each Negro in this group has been mistreated in some degree by the majority, but he is relatively secure, and intelligent. His conviction that violence accomplishes nothing outweighs any resentment he may feel toward the white community. The responsible Negro leadership falls into this group. Unfortunately, these "leaders" have been unable to communicate with the riot-prone Negroes and are no more effective in stopping a riot than is the white leadership. Also, the cream of Negro young men fall into this group, too, but most of them are away serving our country in the armed forces or are busy getting an education and are not available to exert any restraining influence on the riot-prone Negro.

The other 5 to 10% are riot prone. These are the ones who become involved. This 5 to 10% further breaks down as follows: A very small percentage are the extremists—the haters—those whose feelings against "Whitey" are deep and violent. They are blinded by rage. They will burn 9 Negro dwellings to get one owned by a white man. They claim, and possibly believe, that by promoting violence they promote the welfare of

the Negro. Actually and unfortunately, this conviction is strengthened by the fact that, after a riot in a particular city, we move in, spend massive amounts of money, and try to do things we should have done 50 years ago. Most of those in this group are young and they are psychotic. Each is a potential killer. These are the bombers and snipers. These are the ones who give the killing of policemen and firemen top priority in any riot. This group of extremists is very small but seems to be growing steadily. Incidentally, white extremists have not, so far, become active in any riot. It has been rumored, however, that white extremists have given financial support to black extremists. We've never been able to confirm this rumor; but there is considerable logic behind it. For example, if I were the head of a white extremist group held together by hatred of the Negro, and had some money in the treasury, I'd give that money to some militant revolutionist, like Rap Brown or Stokely Carmichael, who preaches hate, violence, and rebellion, and who, for some reason I'll never understand, manages to get massive attention in the media far out of proportion to his importance. I can't imagine a more effective way to slow the progress of the Negro.

In addition to the haters, you have a small percentage of political extremists and agitators—principally communists—involved in every riot. These people want riots to occur for political reasons.

You also have a small percentage of professional or confirmed criminals—mostly thieves—who want riots to occur because they can operate at maximum speed with minimum risk in a riot. I recall one professional burglar who had a ball during the Watts Riots. As soon as things really got going, he backed a moving van up to the rear door of an appliance store and cleaned out the store. He got as far east as Kansas City, driving his van full of stoves, TV sets, and refrigerators, before we caught him.

These racists (the haters), the political extremists and agitators, and the confirmed criminals are the real villains. They are criminals in the truest sense. They are dangerous. They comprise at most 20% of the participants in any modern American riot. They probably are strong enough to start a riot, particularly if they follow the suggestions outlined below; but they haven't started one yet. As a matter of fact, they haven't had to. Enough riots start accidentally to keep any extremist reasonably happy. Certainly, after a riot starts, this group moves in fast and pours fuel on the flames and tries to make the riot as bloody, as damaging, and as extensive as possible. The fact is, though, that while this 20% could probably start a riot, they can't sustain it.

Only the remaining 80% of the 5 to 10% can sustain a riot. Only this 80% can make a riot truly successful, make it last anywhere from 24 hours to a week. People in this group are not sufficiently stable or responsible to be part of the 90 to 95% of the Negro community who are not potential rioters; on the other hand, they are not true criminals. They are not basically bad. They are only junior-grade criminals. They are the looters, the burners, and the rock-throwers. They are the back-bone of any riot. Most of them have been previously arrested; but that's not significant—the fact that a Negro in a slum area has been arrested does not necessarily mean that he has done anything wrong. Many have prior convictions, usually misdemeanors, usually petty theft. These junior-grade criminals, however, have one thing in common—a resentment toward the so-called "power structure". Consciously or subconsciously, they harbor a grudge against "Whites". Often, the resentment has been controlled or suppressed until a riot starts. In some, the hatred or resentment is deep enough to permit them to burn buildings. In others, it is not that strong, but strong enough to enable

them to participate in looting. In others, it is strong enough only for rock throwing. In some, it is so weak that the person would not even steal except that the riot provides an irresistible opportunity.

Now that we've described the ingredients, people-wise, let's consider conditions essential to any successful riot. You can't just have a big riot any old time and place, you know. It's like Grunion hunting. Conditions must be right.

Climate is important. In recent years, there has never been a successful riot in a snowstorm. A heavy rainstorm is also bad. Hot, humid weather is best.

And now, an essential condition: There must exist in the community where the riot is to occur a disadvantaged minority, a group that has been mistreated by the majority (in ways ranging from polite discrimination to physical abuse) for a substantial period of time. Any kind of minority will do; but historically, most successful riots have involved religious, ethnic, or racial minorities. Often throughout our history, this condition has existed to a satisfactory degree—for example, during the period when the Irish were the favorite target of the majority, and later, the Italian-Americans in the East and the Orientals in California took the brunt. There has never been a period in our history, though, when this condition existed to the ideal degree that it exists today. Unlike the Irish and Italians, the Negro did not come to this country voluntarily, so his resentment against mistreatment is logically greater. Also, the Negro, though a free American for over 100 years, has been the target of discrimination and prejudice during this entire time—a more than adequate period. Also, fortunately, or unfortunately, the Negro looks "different" and is easy to identify. Then, too, the Negro minority is just the right size. 5% is adequate; 10% is ideal. The Negro comprises 11% of our population. Actually, in this connection, when a riot occurs in a place like Newark where the minority comprises over 50% of the population, it is a waste of manpower.

Now let's consider another essential "condition". There must be widespread disobedience of and lack of respect for law and order. We need not spend much time discussing this condition, because it must be obvious that in this regard the climate in our country today is ideal. There has not been a time in our recent history when the rule of law was so in jeopardy—not just from militant extremist Negroes but from citizens in all walks of life and all levels of society. Many Americans regularly and openly disobey laws they don't like. The traditional method of seeking changes in the law by urging legislative action seems old-fashioned. We have been sophisticating law and morality out of existence. Discipline as a means of regulating human behavior has gone out of style. Certain national magazines do everything possible to popularize the use of illegal drugs. Famous scientists encourage lying in front of mail trucks, blocking traffic and troop trains, and assorted resistance to authority. Prominent educators encourage students to use LSD. An editorial in the student newspaper at one of our nation's great universities urges its readers to smoke marijuana in violation of the law. When police are called upon to preserve order, they are often jeered, insulted, and spat upon by the very people they are paid to protect. Screams of "police brutality" drown out those who urge higher standards and training, and better pay, and a higher degree of professionalization for law enforcement. Those interested in more and bigger riots could hardly ask for more.

And now, let's consider one final condition. It is desirable, though probably not essential, that tension exist between the races throughout the land. I say tension is not essential because it is so easy to create if it doesn't exist. If tension reaches the level of hysteria,

as it has in this country, then the riot climate is ideal. Speaking of tension, we can't be surprised when we hear the Powells, Carmichaels, and Rap Browns cry "Blood will flow!", "Riots are essential!", "Go get your guns!", etc., etc., etc., but we must be amazed to see the help these extremists get from supposedly reasonable people. For example, I recently heard a self-proclaimed civil rights leader in my community say that unless a certain number of jobs were created immediately and given to persons without regard to skill or qualifications, that there would certainly be another Watts. Incidentally, when I accused him of inviting trouble, he was highly incensed and claimed he was just reporting "facts". It's become standard operating procedure for a Congressman or Senator who wants to dip into the pork barrel and get millions of dollars poured into his district under some poorly-planned and potentially useless project, to urge passage on the basis that it is essential to prevent a riot. And here's the best example of all—The Republican Coordinating Committee in Washington accused the President of playing politics and refusing to act to prevent a riot in Detroit; and Lyndon Johnson, understandably irritated, forgot that a President is supposed to rise above this sort of thing and responded by blaming Governor Romney for not stopping the riot there. On the same day, Senator McClellan blamed the Supreme Court for "creating an atmosphere in which riots flourish." A few days later, Governor Romney, in a most intemperate statement, accused President Johnson of lying. Glory be! What more could an anarchist ask for?

Now, when "conditions" are right, you can sit back and wait for a riot to start. Some commies and extremists claim credit for starting certain of the recent riots, but they are just bragging. They don't deserve the credit. The fact is, all the recent riots have started accidentally, triggered by some explainable incident. The incident usually, but not always, involves a confrontation between a Negro and a white policeman; but in Hartford, Connecticut, a fight between two Negroes was sufficient. The rumor following the incident has normally been more important than the incident. In Watts, the arrest of the Frye's drew a crowd; but the rumor that the police were beating a pregnant Negro woman (who wasn't pregnant and wasn't beaten) started the riot. In Newark, a Negro taxi driver was arrested for a traffic violation; but the false rumor that he had been killed by a white policeman triggered the riot. Normally, after the incident, the rumor follows; the crowd gathers following the rumor; then, if someone starts throwing rocks, and breaking windows (and so far, someone always has) the riot starts.

In case you don't want to wait for a riot to start by spontaneous combustion, there are several things you can do to start one.

First, it is important that you select the right city as the location for your riot. It need not be a big city—even Waterloo, Iowa, a town of 75,000, will do—so long as the necessary conditions exist. Don't select a city that has recently experienced a riot. Once citizens of a community, black and white, know a riot can happen, they try harder to prevent a repeat. It is difficult to start a second riot. Also, the police are better prepared after the first riot. For example, there is a very critical period after the first rock is thrown, the first window broken, when the police can move in with massive but restrained force and possibly prevent a riot. The first time, however, police action will not likely be swift and decisive enough. That, of course, is understandable. Just as a puppy who is spanked every time he barks is not likely to be a good watch dog, so is a police department that for years has been accused of being overly aggressive apt to not be aggressive enough. In Los Angeles and Newark the police did not overreact; they